

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 21, 23, 25-30, and 32-33 were originally pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, 21, and 29 were amended. Claim 34 was added. No claims were canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 21, 23, 25-30, and 32-34 are pending. In view of the following arguments, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 21, 23, 25-30, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuart, in view of Spanbauer, in view of published EP Patent Application No. 01109486.9 published as EP 1,150,207 for inventors Suzuki et al (“Suzuki”), in view of “Binary Version Management for Computational Grids” by Hollingsworth et al (“Hollingsworth - Binary”), and further in view of “Using Content Derived Names for Configuration Management” (“Hollingsworth - Using”). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites:

“assigning each of a plurality of data files to one of a plurality of specific corresponding downloadable file groups”, “generating processed images and a listing of unique identifiers as follows: for each downloadable file group: compressing together data files assigned to the downloadable file group to form one processed image; and deriving a unique identifier for the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived from a portion of the one processed image, the portion being less than a whole of the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived such that if a different image of the processed images shares the unique identifier, the unique identifier indicates that all content inside the different image is identical to all content inside the one processed image”, “storing the processed images and the listing of unique identifiers to

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

a source device", "comparing the listing of unique identifiers with a current listing of unique identifiers in a client device", and "selectively sending processed images from the source device whose unique identifiers appear in the listing of unique identifiers but not in the current listing of unique identifiers in the client device".

Nether Stuart, Spanbauer, Suzuki, Hollingsworth-Binary and/or Hollingsworth - Using disclose these recited features of claim 1.

As a preliminary matter, the Office agreed with Applicant's representative during a July 07, 2005 telephone interview that the reference group of Stuart in view of Spanbauer in view of Suzuki and further in view of *Hollingsworth - Binary* did not teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 21, 23, 25-30, 32, and 33. More particularly, the Office agreed that the indicated combination of references did not teach or suggest "deriving a unique identifier for the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived from a portion of the one processed image, the portion being less than a whole of the one processed image", as claim 1 recites. Applicant thanks the Office for affirming this lack of teaching or suggestion in the received Interview Summary dated 7/11/2005.

To supply this missing feature, the Office Action ("Action") modifies the teachings of Stuart in view of Spanbauer in view of Suzuki in view of *Hollingsworth - Binary* with the teachings of *Hollingsworth - Using*. More particularly, the Action points page 106, paragraphs 1 and 2, of *Hollingsworth - Using* wherein it is disclosed that a content derived name (CDN) is generated by hashing less than all of a packages' (object's) content. In view of this teaching, the Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to arrived at the features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Hollingsworth – Using teaches that adding customizations to an object could change not only the content of the object, but any resulting CDN generated from that object. To make sure that CDN's created for objects that include customization data are not created in view of the customization data, *Hollingsworth – Using* in the first paragraph of page 106 explicitly teaches that the object's customization data is not used to create the CDN for the object. This means that respective CDNs of two different objects that encapsulate different respective customization data can share the same CDN. That is, CDNs of *Hollingsworth – Using* that are created using less than all of respective object data do not indicate that all content of a corresponding object is the same or different than all content of another similarly created object. This is because two objects with different customization information (i.e., content) can share the same CDN. Thus, a system of Stuart in view of Spanbauer in view of Suzuki in view of *Hollingsworth – Binary* and further in view of *Hollingsworth – Using* may never “deriving a unique identifier for the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived from a portion of the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived such that if a different image of the processed images shares the unique identifier, the unique identifier indicates that all content inside the different image is identical to all content inside the one processed image, as claim 1 recites. (This is clearly supported at page 13, lines 15-22, of the specification). For at least these reasons the features of claim 1 are not obvious over the cited combination of references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 25 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. At least for reasons of this dependency, claims 2, 4, 5, and 25 are allowable over the cited combination.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, and 25 is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 recites in part “assigning each of a plurality of data files to one of a plurality of specific corresponding downloadable file groups”, “generating processed images and a listing of unique identifiers as follows: for each downloadable file group, compressing together data files assigned to the file group to form a respective processed image of the processed images for the downloadable file group”, “deriving a unique identifier of the unique identifiers for the respective processed image, the unique identifier being derived such that if a different image of the processed images shares the unique identifier, the unique identifier indicates that all content inside the different image is identical to all content inside the one processed image, the one or more portions representing less than a whole of the respective processed image”, and “storing the processed images and the listing of unique identifiers to a source device”.

For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, *Stuart, Spanbauer, Suzuki et al, Hollingsworth – Binary and/or Hollingsworth - Using* does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 8.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11, 12 and 26 depend from claim 8 and recite additional features. At least for reasons of this dependency on claim 8, claims 9, 11, 12 and 26 are allowable over the cited combination.

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 9, 11, 12 and 26 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 recites “generating processed images and a listing of unique identifiers by: assigning each of a plurality of data files to one of a plurality of specific corresponding downloadable file groups”. And “for each downloadable file group: compressing together data files assigned to the downloadable file group to form one processed image of the processed images ; and deriving, using a portion of the one processed image, a unique identifier of the unique identifiers for the one processed image, the portion being less than a whole of the processed image, the unique identifier being derived such that if a different image of the processed images shares the unique identifier, the unique identifier indicates that all content inside the different image is identical to all content inside the one processed image”. “[S]toring the processed images and the listing of unique identifiers to the memory”, and “comparing the listing of unique identifiers with a current listing of unique identifiers associated with a client device to identify processed images for providing to the client device.”

For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, *Stuart, Spanbauer, Suzuki et al, Hollingsworth – Binary and/or Hollingsworth - Using* does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 15.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 depends from claim 15 and recite additional features. At least for reasons of this dependency on claim 15, claim 27 is allowable over the cited combination.

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 27 is respectfully requested wn.

Claim 21 recites in part “assign each of a plurality of server-based data files to one of a plurality of specific corresponding server-based downloadable file groups”, and “generate processed images and a listing of unique identifiers as follows: for each server-based downloadable file group, the server device is configured to: compress together data files assigned to the server-based downloadable file group to form one processed image of the processed images; and derive a unique identifier of the unique identifiers for the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived based on a portion of the processed image, the portion being less than a whole of the processed image, the unique identifier being derived such that if a different image of the processed images shares the unique identifier, the unique identifier indicates that all content inside the different image is identical to all content inside the one processed image”, as well as “selectively output the processed images and a latest listing of the unique identifiers over the network”.

For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, *Stuart, Spanbauer, Suzuki et al, Hollingsworth – Binary and/or Hollingsworth - Using* does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 21.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Claims 23, 28, and 34 depend from claim 21, and recite additional features. At least for reasons of this dependency, claims 23, 28, and 34 are allowable over the cited combination.

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 23 and 28 should be withdrawn.

Claim 29 recites “assigning each of a plurality of data files to one of a plurality of specific corresponding downloadable file groups”, and “generating processed images and a listing of unique identifiers as follows: for each downloadable file group, compressing together data files assigned to the downloadable file group to form one processed image of the processed images” and “deriving a unique identifier of the unique identifiers for the one processed image, the unique identifier being derived using a portion of the processed image, the portion being less than a whole of the processed image, the unique identifier being derived such that if a different image of the processed images shares the unique identifier, the unique identifier indicates that all content inside the different image is identical to all content inside the one processed image”.

For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, *Stuart, Spanbauer, Suzuki et al; Hollingsworth – Binary and/or Hollingsworth - Using* does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 29.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 29 is respectfully requested.

Claims 30, 32, and 33 depend from claim 29, and recite additional features. At least for reasons of this dependency, claims 30, 32, and 33 are allowable over the cited combination.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 30, 32, and 33 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, new **claim 34** recites “[t]he system of claim 21, wherein the client device is further configured to access at least a subset of content associated

Serial. No. 09/756,052
Response to August 15, 2005 Non-Final Office Action

at with downloaded processed images through a compressed file system driver, the compressed file system driver being configured to open and decompress content of the downloaded processed images using a compression scheme implemented by the server device to compress together the data files.” The cited combinations of references do not teach or suggest these claimed features. These claimed features are described by the specification as filed (e.g., please see page 13, lines 7-22).

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11/15/2005

By: Brian Hunt
Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44,421
(509) 324-9256